

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant thanks the Examiner and her Primary Examiner for conducting a telephone interview with Applicant's representatives, James Goepel and John Wittenzellner on February 13, 2008, to discuss the pending claims. Applicant's representatives appreciate the Examiner's insight into her interpretation of the Campbell reference and her approach to claim construction.

Newly added claims 37–68 are currently pending the instant application. Claims 1–36 have been cancelled. Applicant acknowledges receipt of the above-identified Office Action, and respectfully traverses the Office Action in its entirety.

Rejections of Previously Pending Claims

The Examiner rejected previously pending claims 1-3, 5-9, 12-15, and 17-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campbell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,047,259, hereinafter “Campbell”), Hayward et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,574,828, hereinafter “Hayward”), Johnson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,664,109, hereinafter “Johnson”), Cummings, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 5,301,105, hereinafter “Cummings”), and Kaker et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0037218 A1). Although Applicant's cancellation of the previously pending claims have rendered the Examiner's rejections moot, Applicant respectfully submits that none of the previously cited prior art references, nor any combination thereof teaches or suggests the consolidation of the requisite data entry fields into a single screen, the use of a navigation module to modify the fields in response to patient clinical encounter information being entered by a user, or the verification of that information on the client-side prior to submitting the information to a server, as positively recited in newly added claims 37–68.

Campbell discloses a computer-implemented method and system for tracking workflow through a medical facility, managing medical exams of patients in the facility, and managing treatment protocols for the patients. Multiple user interface screens, arranged in a hierarchy, are provided for conducting a medical exam. Campbell; Col. 12, line 59 to Col. 13, line 18. When a user selects an area within the hierarchy, the system “launches a new screen for the selected part of the physical exam.” *Id.* Medical data entered by the user is sent to a server for validation and used by the server to determine whether the user should collect additional information. *Id.*

Hayward provides a program used to write other programs for the implementation of guidelines in situations where a qualification decision or next course of action determination must be made, using questions with limited choice answers. Data provided in answer to the

questions causes a second program to be automatically generated based on the answers. The second program then elicits responses in an interactive manner. Qualification decisions and courses of action are suggested as an output of the second program. Hayward; Abstract.

Johnson provides a system and method for extracting pre-defined data fields from medical records. The hand-written or typed medical records are inputted into the system via an OCR system and stored in a database. Relevant fields are extracted by applying a rule set to the OCR capture stored in the database.

Cummings provides a healthcare management system comprising a plurality of data input terminals and a processing system server. Cummings; column 4, lines 7-14. Processing of the medical data inputted into the data input terminals is performed solely on the processing system server. Cummings; Fig 3, column 7, lines 39-60.

Kaker provides an online system for providing prescription assistance to a user via a web server connected to a database and a web browser running on a user workstation. Data is processed on the server side.

CONCLUSION

Having responded to all objections and rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action, it is submitted that the currently pending claims are in condition for allowance and Notice to that effect is respectfully solicited. Additional characteristics or arguments may exist that distinguish the claims over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and Applicant respectfully preserves the right to present these in the future, should they be necessary. In the event that the Examiner is of the opinion that a brief telephone or personal interview will facilitate allowance of one or more of the above claims, he is courteously requested to contact applicant's undersigned representative.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this filing, and credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-0653. If an extension of time is required, this should be considered a petition therefor. If the fees associated with a Request for Continued Examination are filed herewith, this should be considered a petition therefor.

Respectfully submitted,

/ John Wittenzellner /

John Wittenzellner
(Reg. No. 61,662)
Agent for Applicant

GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
1750 Tysons Boulevard
Suite 1200
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 749-1389
E-mail: wittenzellnerj@gtlaw.com

Filed: March 7, 2008